

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in the interview held on February 20, 2007. A proposed amendment of claim 1 was discussed. The Examiner suggested a further clarification of the amendment. It was agreed that, after this amendment as discussed, the prior art of record does not anticipate or suggest the present subject matter.

In response to the office action dated November 27, 2006, Applicants are amending claims 1, 10, 23 and 24, and adding new claim 27. As such, claims 1-27 are pending, of which claims 1, 23, 24 and 27 are independent claims. Favorable consideration of the amended claims is requested.

Claim 1 is being amended to recite receiving "priority information specifying an order in which a plurality of automated remedy procedures is to be performed to address failures of any of the plurality of automated diagnostic procedures, the priority information reflecting dependencies between the automated remedy procedures" and that "each of the automated remedy procedures is configured to change at least one of a configuration or a setting in the computer system". These amendments are supported by the present disclosure, for example in the description of priority information on page 15, line 4—page 24, line 17 (hereafter referred to thus: 15:4—24:17). For example, it is there described that "failure of two or more checks at the same time may indicate that some or all of those checks are dependent on each other." 21:20-22. Corresponding changes are being made in independent claim 23, which is a computer program product claim, and in claim 24, which relates to a graphical user interface. Dependent claim 10 is being amended to clarify the updating of the priority information. This is supported by the description that greater weight may be given to the fact that a check eliminates an error, or that it causes an additional error, than to the fact that several checks failed simultaneously. 22:1-8. No new matter is added.

New independent claim 27 is based on original dependent claim 6, which was found allowable in the office action. Particularly, independent claim 27 has been written in computer-program product form reciting operations executable by a processor. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the indication in the office action that dependent claim 6 is allowable. As noted above, new independent claim 27 includes subject matter from the claim that was found allowable. This new claim should therefore also be allowable.

In the office action, the abstract was objected to because of a document management program number that was included at the bottom. Applicant is submitting an amended abstract with this response and asks that the objection be removed.

Claims 23-26 were rejected under § 101 due to the term "information carrier". Applicant is amending these claims to instead use the term "machine-readable storage device" which was suggested in the office action. Accordingly, applicants ask that the rejection be removed. Applicant does not concede that the rejection has merit.

Dependent claim 10 was rejected under § 112, second paragraph, due to the phrase "less significant". Applicant is amending this claim so that it does not use this phrase. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be removed. Applicant is not conceding that the rejection has merit.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 23 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,111,383 ("Kimura"). Claims 1, 7 and 8 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by IBM Disclosure NNRD449113 ("IBM"). Claims 1-5, 7, 11 and 13-26 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Kimura in view of U.S. 6,134,644 ("Mayuzumi"). Claim 9 was rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over IBM in view of U.S. 6,195,763 ("Mayer"). Claims 11-12 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over IBM in view of U.S. 20020116666 ("Perez").

These rejections are rendered moot by the amendments of the claims. Moreover, it was agreed in the interview that the claims as amended are not anticipated or suggested by the prior art of record. Therefore, favorable consideration of the amended claims is requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or

other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

This response is filed within the shortened statutory period and no fee is therefore due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Date: 2/26/07

Respectfully submitted,



J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696